

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 5, 2004. Claims 1-10 and 19-22 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 7-10, and 20-22 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that Claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten so as not to depend from a rejected claim, and with no change in scope. These claims have not been so rewritten because, for the reasons given below, their base claim is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1, 7-10, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,666 (*Fujisaki et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,546,538 (*Cobbley et al.*), and Claims 2-4 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujisaki et al.* in view of *Cobbley et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 5,966,637 (*Kanungo et al.*).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 19-22 for the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is a character-string information output apparatus for outputting character-string information supported by a predetermined character encoding scheme. The character-string information output apparatus comprises search means, extraction means, and character-string information output means. The search means searches, from the external memory, character-string information having identical contents and supported by a plurality of different character encoding schemes, in a case where it is instructed to output the character-string information. The extraction means extracts the character encoding scheme interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus from the character encoding schemes

supporting the character-string information searched by the search means, and the character-string information output means outputs the character-string information supported by the extracted character encoding scheme.

Among other important features of Claim 1 are searching, from the external memory, character-string information having identical contents and supported by the plurality of different character encoding schemes and extracting the character encoding scheme that is interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus so as to output the character-string information supported by the character encoding scheme. That is, the apparatus of Claim 1 searches an interpretable character encoding scheme (for example, Shift-JIS) from among the plurality of different character encoding schemes (for example Shift-JIS, EUC, and Unicode) representing the character-string information having identical contents, and outputs the character encoding scheme that is interpretable by the character-string information output apparatus from among the plurality of different character encoding schemes representing identical character-string information.

Fujisaki et al. relates to information entry systems using handwriting recognition technology. The Office Action cites column 8, lines 45-49, and column 10, lines 27-33, of *Fujisaki et al.* as equating to a plurality of character-encoding schemes. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this understanding of *Fujisaki et al.* The cited passages merely discuss encoding recognized handwritten characters by a clustering scheme and comparing the encoded handwritten characters with dictionary data encoded by the same clustering scheme. However, Applicant has found nothing in *Fujisaki et al.* that would teach or suggest searching, from the external memory, character-string information having identical contents and supported by the plurality of different character encoding schemes and extracting the character encoding scheme that is interpretable by the

character-string information output apparatus so as to output the character-string information supported by the character encoding scheme, as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant further submits that *Cobbley et al.* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Fujisaki et al.* as prior art.

Applicant submits that neither *Fujisaki et al.*, *Cobbley et al.*, nor any combination thereof (assuming *arguendo* that any such combination would be permissible) teaches or suggests the character-string information output apparatus as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claims 19 and 20 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Additionally, independent Claims 7-10, 21, and 22 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 7-10, 21, and 22 are believed to be patentable for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
NY_MAIN 431697